



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/503,990	02/14/2000	Mahmoud R. Sherif	2-7	7379

7590 09/10/2003

Lucent Technologies Inc  
Docket Administrator (Room 3C-512)  
600 Mountain Ave  
P O Box 636  
Murray Hill, NJ 07974-0636

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

ZEWDU, MELESS NMN

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2683

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

6

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/503,990	SHERIF ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Meless N Zewdu	2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 June 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) none is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,2,9-11 and 15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 3-8 and 12-14 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the communication filed on 6/19/03.
2. Claims 1-15 are pending in this action.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

I. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

II. Claims 1, 2, 9-11 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weaver, Jr. et al. (Weaver) (US 5,903,862) in view of Simon Haykin (Haykin), adaptive Filter Theory, third edition, 1996, pages 2-5 and 9-21.

**As per claim 1:** a method for communicating comprising the steps of:

Receiving, a first encoded voice signal as a first set of voice signal parameters reads on '862 (see figs. 1, 2, 6 and 7; col. 3, lines 332-35).

Directing, the first set of voice signal parameters to a first speech decoder to generate a voice signal reads on '862 (see figs. 1, 2, 6 and 7; col. 3, lines 42-46).

Transmitting, the second set of voice signal parameters reads on '862 (see col. 4, lines 44-49).

But, Weaver does not explicitly teach about feeding the voice signal from the first speech decoder to an adaptive filter to produce a modified voice signal, as claimed by applicant. However, in a related field of endeavor, Haykin teaches that "The ability of an adaptive filter to operate satisfactorily in an unknown environment and track time variations of input statistics make the adaptive filter a powerful device for signal processing and control applications. Indeed, adaptive filters have been successfully applied in such diverse fields as communications, radar, sonar, seismology, and biomedical engineering. Furthermore, Haykin also states "an input vector and a desired response are used to compute an estimation error, which is in turn used to control the values of a set of adjustable filter coefficients (see page 18, lines 11-24). According to the teaching, an adaptive filter can be used in an "unknown environment" which can include the environment between vocoders of a transmitter and a receiver (tandem vocoders), for controlling an output signal using the input and a desired response to compute an estimated error by which values of the adaptive filter coefficients are adjusted. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Weaver by that of Haykin for the advantage of adaptively canceling noise and/or echo in a communication system (see page 21, table 1). Note: the specific location in a circuit, as to where to place an adaptive filter, is within the realm of a choice of design by one of skilled in the art.

**As per claim 2:** the method further comprising the steps of:

Modifying the spectrum of the voice signal from the first speech decoder using the adaptive filter which compensates for digital distortion which will occur when the encoded modified voice signal represented by the encoded set of voice signal parameters is decoded reads on '862 (see abstract; col. 2, lines 32-48). When modified

as shown in the rejection of claim 1, the system would have an adaptive filter to compensate for signal loss caused by external or internal interference or/and noise.

**As per claim 9:** Claim 9 is rejected on the same ground and motivation as claim 1 since claim 9 is the apparatus claim that must carry out the method steps of claim 1.

**As per claim 10:** the structure wherein the adaptive filter modifies the magnitude of selective frequencies of the spectrum of the voice signal from the decoder reads on 'Haykin (see page 18, the sub-title, 7. Applications).

**As per claim 11:** the structure wherein the adaptive filter modifies the magnitude of selective frequencies of the spectrum of the voice signal from the decoder to compensate for digital distortion caused by encoding and decoding the modified voice signal reads on 'Haykin (see page 18, the sub-title, 7. Applications). According to the teaching, the input signal to the adaptive filter could be any digital signal transmitted in an environment that has noise or interference. Furthermore, it is obvious from the teaching that a magnitude of a signal is reduced by the amount of an estimated error.

**As per claim 15:** the structure wherein the adaptive filter increases the db of selective frequencies of the spectrum please refer to claim 1.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

III. Claims 3-8 and 12-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Response to Arguments***

3. In response to applicant's argument regarding Minkoff's reference (US 6,434,235 B1), examiner agrees with applicant and thus has remove the reference in question from being used in the rejection of the instant application as a prior art. Furthermore, examiner would like to extend an apology to applicant for the inadvertent use of the prior art in question.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Meless N Zewdu whose telephone number is (703) 306-5418. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am to 5:00 pm..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on (703) 308-5318. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.



WILLIAM TROST  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Meless Zewdu *M. Z.*  
Examiner

29 August 2003.